

Third Party, and to make a separate peace with France, if his demands were not granted. Every Sovereign too had his ministers and favourites; and these ministers and favourites were perpetually hinting that France was willing to pay them for detaching their masters from the coalition, and that it would be prudent in England and Holland to outbid France.¹

After challenging this description of the part taken by the German princes in the war and pointing out some serious errors in Macaulay's statements about Saxony, Hanover,² and Brandenburg, Kemble concludes by regretting that one error pervades the whole book, viz. the striving to exalt William at the expense of everyone with whom he is brought into contact', and by protesting against 'the distortion of view which presents our foreign relations in so untrue a light, and for the sake of displaying one giant, peoples all Europe with pigmies/

These criticisms were brought to the notice of Macaulay but he dismissed them very lightly. In his diary, he says of the article:

Very laudatory. The author evidently John Kemble. He is quite right in saying that *I* have passed lightly over continental politics. But was this wrong? ... I am writing a History of England ; and as to grubbing, as he recommends, in Saxon and Hessian archives for the purpose of ascertaining all the details of the continental negotiations of

that time, I should have doubled my labour,
already severe
enough. That I have not given a generally
correct view of
our continental relations he certainly has not
shown.³

¹V, 2210-12 (xix).

²For instance, he says, * For the Duke of Brunswick
Lunenbourg, William
not without difficulty procured the long desired title of
Elector of Hanover.*
William's intervention had but a small share in the
achievement of this
result. See A. W. Ward, *The Electress Sophia* (1909), pp.
226-39.

³Trevelyan, ii. 442.